

REMARKS

Claims 44-48, 51-54, 70, and 72-104 are pending in this application, with claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100 being independent. Claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100 have been amended.

Independent claims 44 and 72 have been rejected along with their dependent claims 45-48 and 51-54 as being unpatentable over Mawatari (U.S. Patent No. 5,200,847) in view of Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,559) and Sawatsubashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,148,301). Each of claims 44 and 72, as amended, recites an active matrix type display device including “a resin formed on [a] substrate; a base film on said resin; [and] a driver circuit comprising thin film transistors on said base film, *wherein said base film is formed between said resin and said driver circuit*” (emphasis added). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 44 and 72 because neither Mawatari, Yamazaki, Sawatsubashi, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests the recited base film.

In Mawatari, the substrate 118a, which the Examiner equates to the recited base film, is not formed between the driver element securing resin 125, which the Examiner equates to the recited resin, and the display driving circuit 120, which the Examiner equates to the recited driver circuit. Rather, as shown in Fig. 4 of Mawatari, the display driving circuit 120 is formed between the substrate 118a and the driver element securing resin 125. Accordingly, Mawatari does not describe or suggest the recited base film.

Yamazaki, which describes a circuit to dynamically activate an electro-optical device, and Sawatsubashi, which describes a liquid crystal display device formed from two substrates disposed to face each other, do not remedy the failure of Mawatari to describe or suggest the recited base film.

For at least these reasons, neither Mawatari, Yamazaki, Sawatsubashi, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests the recited base film, and, accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 44 and 72, and their dependent claims.

Independent claims 72, 78, 90, and 95 have been rejected along with their dependent claims 73-77, 79-83, 91-94, and 96-99 as being unpatentable over Mawatari in view of

Yamazaki. Claims 72, 78, 90, and 95, as amended, recite an active matrix type display device including “a resin formed on [or over] a substrate,” “a base film on said resin” and “a driver circuit” or “a semiconductive layer” on said base film, *“wherein said base film is formed between said resin and said driver circuit/semiconductive layer”* (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons describe above in reference to claims 44 and 72, neither Mawatari, Yamazaki, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests the recited base film. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 72, 78, 90, and 95, and their dependent claims.

Independent claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100, along with their dependent claims 45-48, 51-54, 70, 73-77, 79-83, 85-89, 91-94, 96-99, and 101-104, have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17 and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,327 (the ‘327 patent).

Independent claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100, as amended, recite an active matrix type display including the limitation that the “base film is formed between said resin and said driver circuit/semiconductive layer”. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection of claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100 because claims 17 and 24 of the ‘327 patent do not claim the recited base film or an obvious variant of the recited base film.

Claims 17 and 24 of the ‘327 patent recite a method of manufacturing a liquid crystal display having a pair of first and second substrates, the method including the steps of “forming a peeling layer on a glass substrate, forming an underlying film on the peeling layer; forming a semiconductor integrated circuit on the underlying film; … [and] attaching said glass substrate provided with said semiconductor integrated circuit to one of the first and second substrates with an adhesive therebetween”. Claims 17 and 24, however, in no way describe or suggest that the “underlying layer”, which the Examiner equates to the recited base film, is formed between the “adhesive layer”, which the Examiner equates to the recited resin, and the “semiconductor integrated circuit”, which the Examiner equates to the recited driver circuit/semiconductive layer. For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection of claims 44, 72, 78, 84, 90, 95, and 100, and their dependent claims.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki, et al.  
Serial No. : 09/126,826  
Filed : July 31, 1998  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-019002 / US  
2961/2965/2966D1

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/25/03

  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40188385.doc